

**REMARKS**

The rejections of Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Sugawara and Lyons, of Claims 6 and 7 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Sugawara and Lyons, and further in view of Hart, of Claim 10 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Sugawara and Lyons, and further in view of Sugimoto, of Claims 13 and 14 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Sugawara and Lyons, and further in view of Saylor, and of Claims 17 and 18 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Sugawara, each under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a), are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration of each rejection is now requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The subject matter of cancelled Claims 2 is now in amended Claim 1 along with further limitations based upon [[0027]] of the disclosure. Claim 17 now includes all the elements of amended Claim 1. As to the rejections of Claims 17 and 18, the rejection based upon Davis and Sugawara should now be withdrawn.

None of the cited references, even taken in hypothetical combination, teach or suggest the concept of providing a detector for determining an object's relative speed with a control device that determines from that relative speed if the object is an intruder candidate or a moving-way candidate and a recorder that starts recording when an intruding object is determined.

The David, Sugawara and Lyons patents are central to all the rejections. David discloses none of the aforementioned features. The Office Action acknowledges that not even obtaining the object's relative speed and location is a feature taught in Davis.

The same can be said about the Sugawara patent that does not even involve a security system for instruction detection but a vehicle radar device for avoiding roadside objects. Absent impermissible hindsight, one of ordinary skill in the security system art would not have been motivated to look to the teaching of Sugawara. Putting impermissible hindsight aside, however, the resulting hypothetical combination would have fallen far short of the claimed invention herein.

Similarly, the use of Lyons tracking system reflects the use of impermissible hindsight in reaching beyond security system technology into another art for the purpose of finding a moving mechanism in the form of a tracking camera. Again, however, even with the combination of all these features, as well as those provided by the Hart, Sugimoto and/or Saylor patents, the hypothetical combination would not yield the claimed security system save perhaps from aggregating features or yet other non-analogous prior art.

According, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056207.53157US).

Respectfully submitted,

April 2, 2008



---

James F. McKeown  
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JFM:slw

5199461\_1.DOC